arXiv:1611.00288v1 [math.NA] 1 Nov 2016

Variants of the CMRH method for solving multi-shifted non-Hermitian linear systems

Xian-Ming Gu[1,2,*], Ting-Zhu Huang[1,†], Bruno Carpentieri[3,‡]
Akira Imakura[4,§], Ke Zhang[5,¶], Lei Du[6,‖]

1. School of Mathematical Sciences,

University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, 611731, P.R. China

2. Institute of Mathematics and Computing Science,

University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 9, PO Box 407, 9700 AK Groningen, The Netherlands

3. School of Science and Technology,

Nottingham Trent University, Clifton Campus, Nottingham, NG11 8NS, UK

4. Graduate School of Systems and Information Engineering,

University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1 Tennodai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8573, Japan

5. College of Arts and Sciences, Shanghai Maritime University, Shanghai, 201306, P.R. China

6. School of Mathematical Sciences, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, P.R. China

Abstract

The multi-shifted linear systems with non-Hermitian matrices often arise from the numerical solutions for time-dependent partial/fractional differential equations (PDEs/FDEs), control theory, PageRank problem, etc. In the present paper, we derive the variants of restarted CMRH (Changing Minimal Residual method based on the Hessenberg process), in which the Hessenberg process is always cheaper than the conventional Arnoldi procedure, for solving such sequence of shifted linear systems. In order to accelerate the iterative solvers, we also present both methods inside of a general framework which allows these techniques to be extended to the setting of flexible preconditioning and inexact Krylov subspace methods. Finally, extensive numerical experiments involving the numerical solutions of PDEs/FDEs

[*] *E-mail address:* guxianming@live.cn; x.m.gu@rug.nl
[†] Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* tingzhuhuang@126.com. Tel.: 86-28-61831608.
[‡] *E-mail address:* bcarpentieri@gmail.com
[§] *E-mail address:* imakura@cs.tsukuba.ac.jp
[¶] *E-mail address:* xznuzk123@126.com
[‖] *E-mail address:* dulei@dlut.edu.cn

and PageRank problems are reported to illustrate the performance of these proposed methods, also against other popular multi-shifted Krylov subspace methods.

Key words: Krylov subspace method; Shifted linear system; Hessenberg procedure; GMRES; Shifted CMRH method; FDEs.

AMS Classification: 65F12; 65L05; 65N22.

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we are interested in the simultaneous solutions of t nonsymmetric linear systems with the following form:

$$(A - \sigma_i I)\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{b}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s, \tag{1.1}$$

where scalar shift parameters $\sigma_i \in \mathbb{C}$, I is the identity matrix of order n, the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is large sparse, nonsingular and the right-hand side vector $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In fact, the shifted linear systems often come from the implicit numerical methods for partial differential equations (PDEs) [1, 2] and fractional differential equations (FDEs) [3, 4], control theory [5, 6], large-scale eigenvalue computations [7], quantum chromodynamics (QCD) simulations [8] and other practical simulation applications [9, 10]. So there is a strong need for the efficient solutions of these shifted linear systems (1.1).

Since our non-Hermitian coefficient matrices $A(\sigma_i) := A - \sigma_i I$ are large and sparse, it is remarkable that Krylov subspace solvers are greatly appropriate tools, but it does not share the algorithm information during the solutions of Eq. (1.1) with each scalar shift. Denoting the m-dimensional Krylov subspace with respects to A and $\boldsymbol{b}$ by

$$\mathcal{K}_m(A, \boldsymbol{b}) := \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{b}, A\boldsymbol{b}, \ldots, A^{m-1}\boldsymbol{b}\}, \tag{1.2}$$

then in this case we can exploit the following well-known shift-invariance property of Krylov subspaces [6, 11, 12]

$$\mathcal{K}_m(A, \boldsymbol{b}) = \mathcal{K}_m(A - \sigma_i I, \boldsymbol{b}), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s. \tag{1.3}$$

This means that if we choose initial vectors $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)}$ properly (for example, all initial guesses are zeros), once a basis has been constructed for one of these linear systems, it could also be reused for all other linear systems. Therefore, there is no need to establish bases of all Krylov subspaces $\mathcal{K}_m(A - \sigma_i I, \boldsymbol{b})$ separately, and thus the algorithmic cost required by the basis generation, in aspects of matrix-vector products, can be significantly reduced. This observation results in shifted Krylov subspace methods for solving the shifted linear systems. In other words, when one finds approximate solutions over Krylov subspaces, one can save the cost of generating other $t_s - 1$ Krylov subspaces. This mechanism was shown to be very efficient [11, 12].

In more recent years, various Krylov subspace solvers for shifted non-Hermitian linear systems were proposed in succession. More precisely, iterative solution techniques such as the shifted (TF)QMR [13], the shifted BiCGStab(ℓ) [12], the restarted shifted

FOM [14–17] and shifted IDR(s)-type methods [18–20] have been consecutively developed. It should be noted that methods based on the Bi-Lanczos process [21, pp. 229-233] (or the A-biorthogonalization process [22, pp. 40-45]) have also been developed for solving shifted non-Hermitian linear systems. Extensions of such methods, such as shifted BiCG/BiCGStab [11,12], shifted BiCR/BiCRSTAB [23], and shifted GPBiCG, have been recently established in [24]. Additionally, both the recycling BiCG method and the recycling BiCGSTAB method were introduced and employed for handling shifted nonsymmetric linear systems arising from model reduction [25, 26]. These Krylov subspace solvers based on Bi-Lanczos-like procedures are not emphases in this study, but these alternatives are still worth mentioning.

On the other hand, we consider CMRH (Changing Minimal Residual method based on the Hessenberg process [29, §§6.28-6.30]), introduced in [27, 28], is an interesting Krylov subspace method for solving non-Hermitian linear systems[1]. Moreover, the Hessenberg procedure generally requires less operations and storage than the conventional Arnoldi process [21, pp. 160-165] and is thus attractive for producing a linear system solver, also refer to Refs. [27, 30–32] and our recent work [33] for a further discussion of these issues. In particular, when a large Krylov subspace basis is required for convergence, the CMRH method is significantly faster than GMRES in terms of execution time [30]. Some recent developments concerning the CMRH method and its practical applications can be found in [34, 35]. An implementation of CMRH that is suitable and preferable for parallel architectures is introduced in [30, 35, 36].

As we already know, some efficient variants of the well-known GMRES method [37] have been proposed and improved for solving shifted nonsymmetric linear system, refer to [38–42] for details. In addition, from the development of CMRH, the CMRH method often enjoys many similar computational properties of the GMRES algorithm, see [43] for this discussion. It also has been observed that in practice, CMRH behaves very much like GMRES, in the sense that if GMRES exhibits superlinear converges, so does CMRH for the same problem, and if GMRES stagnates, CMRH does so as well. Furthermore, the convergence curves for these two methods are always very near each other (see e.g., [27, 28, 43]), and we note that CMRH can be implemented with fewer operations per iteration step than GMRES. Since the CMRH method is closely related to the GMRES method and they are both the Krylov subspace methods for nonsymmetric linear systems, so their elegant work gave us a simple and natural question: Does there exist a variant of the CMRH method, which needs very cheap computational cost, for shifted linear systems? Our major contribution is to answer this question. The answer is *yes*, and it also needs to forced the shifted system residual to be colinear to the *seed* system residual, which modified the iterations for the shifted systems. The idea is based on the shift-invariance property of Krylov subspaces as well. As a result, a feature of the resulting algorithm is similar to the restarted shifted GMRES method.

[1] A short note for describing the relations between the ELMRES method [30, 31] and Sadok's CMRH method [27] is available at http://ncsu.edu/hpc/Documents/Publications/gary_howell/contents.html#codes.

In practice, preconditioning shifted systems (1.1) is necessary to accelerate the convergence of shifted Krylov subspace methods and this remains an open question, because standard preconditioning techniques may destroy the shift-invariance property (1.2); see e.g., [6, 11, 20, 33] for a discussion of these issues. In this work, we also construct an inner-outer iterative scheme based on nested Krylov subspace methods, where the inner solver is a multi-shift Krylov subspace method, such as shifted FOM, shifted IDR(s), shifted QMRIDR(s), or shifted BiCGSTAB(ℓ) methods, that acts as a preconditioner for an outer flexible CMRH (FCMRH) method [34]. Then we will do a comparative study of shifted Krylov subspace methods for solving shifted linear systems (1.1), which are often from the recent hot topic: numerical solutions of PDEs/FDEs.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly review the CMRH method and its relative remarks. In the next section, we discuss the shift-invariance property and then show how to generalize the CMRH method for solving the shifted linear systems. Implementation details will be also described. Then we also observe the framework of constructing suitable preconditioning techniques for the shifted CMRH method. Section 4 presents some numerical examples involving quantum chromodynamics (QCD), PageRank and solving PDEs/FDEs application to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed solvers. In Section 5, the paper closes with some concluding remarks.

2 The CMRH method

In this section, let us begin to recall some basic knowledge about the CMRH method. The mechanism of CMRH [27, 43] for the standard linear systems $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$ is to apply the Hessenberg procedure with pivoting[2] to construct a basis of the Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}_m(A, \boldsymbol{r}_0)$: $\{\boldsymbol{l}_1, \boldsymbol{l}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{l}_m\}$, where we often define $\boldsymbol{l}_1 = \boldsymbol{r}_0/\alpha$, with $\alpha = (\boldsymbol{r}_0)_1$, i.e., the first entry of $\boldsymbol{r}_0$. More precisely, the Hessenberg process generates an $n \times m$ unit lower trapezoidal matrix $L_m = (\boldsymbol{l}_1, \boldsymbol{l}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{l}_m)$ and a $(m+1) \times m$ upper Hessenberg matrix $\check{H}_m \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+1)\times m}$, such that

$$AL_m = L_{m+1}\check{H}_m. \tag{2.1}$$

Thus, formally, the CMRH approximate solution $\boldsymbol{x}_m$ is such that $\boldsymbol{x}_m = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{z}_m, \boldsymbol{z}_m \in \mathcal{K}_m(A, \boldsymbol{r}_0)$ which deals with the following constrained problem

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{u}\in\mathbb{C}^{m+1},\ \boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{K}_m(A,\boldsymbol{r}_0)} = \|\boldsymbol{u}\|, \quad \text{subject to} \quad A\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{r}_0 + L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}. \tag{2.2}$$

Since the columns of L_{m+1} are not orthogonal, we cannot compute directly $\boldsymbol{z}_m$ such that the norm of the residual vector is minimized, i.e., satisfy the Eq. (2.2). However, if we

[2]According to Refs. [30, 31, 33], it cannot prove that the Hessenberg process with pivoting strategy is backward stable in finite precision arithmetic. However, in practice for most of the test problems that we considered in our study, it showed to be numerically accurate due to its (very) small backward error.

denote by $L_{m+1}^{\dagger}$ the pseudo-inverse of L_{m+1}, we can write an equivalent formulation for Eq. (2.2) as follows

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{v}\in\mathbb{C}^{m+1},\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{K}_m(A,\boldsymbol{r}_0)} = \|L_{m+1}^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{v}\|, \quad \text{subject to} \quad A\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{r}_0 + \boldsymbol{v};$$

in fact, any left inverse of L_{m+1} will work here, but we use the pseudo-inverse for simplicity; though see further comments in [43, Section 4]. Thus, we can state equivalently that the CMRH approximate solution is $\boldsymbol{x}_m = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + \boldsymbol{z}_m$, where $\boldsymbol{z}_m$ solves

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{K}_m(A,\boldsymbol{r}_0)} = \|L_{m+1}^{\dagger}(A\boldsymbol{z} - \boldsymbol{r}_0)\|,$$

i.e., a quasi-residual is just minimized. This is similar to the well-known QMR method [21, pp. 236-241]. Alternatively we can observe this minimization, as a minimization of the residual using a semi-norm; refer to [27,28]. In terms of implementation, we write $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathcal{K}_m$ as $\boldsymbol{z} = L_m\boldsymbol{y}$, $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{C}^m$, so that the CMRH approximation is $\boldsymbol{x}_m = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + L_m\boldsymbol{y}_m$, where $\boldsymbol{y}_m$ solves

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{C}^m} \|L_{m+1}^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{r}_0 - AL_m\boldsymbol{y})\| &= \min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{C}^m} \|L_{m+1}^{\dagger}(\alpha L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{e}_1^{(k+1)} - L_{m+1}\check{H}_m\boldsymbol{y})\| \\ &= \min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{C}^m} \|\alpha\boldsymbol{e}_1^{(k+1)} - \check{H}_m\boldsymbol{y}\|\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

and this is how CMRH is implemented, i.e., solving the small least squares problem (2.3), refer to [27, 28] for details. Similarly, Although the CMRH method is less expensive and needs slightly less storage than the conventional GMRES method per iteration, the number of vectors requiring storage increases as iteration count and hence the method must be restarted. The restarted version of the CMRH method will be dubbed CMRH(m). For the sake of clarity, here we give the pseudo-code of the (pivoted) CMRH(m) method for solving nonsymmetric linear systems $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$ which is a modification of [27, Algorithm 3] and [28, Algorithm 2].

Finally, we need to mention that as is the case with QMR, CMRH is also a *non-optimal method* since the basis chosen for $\mathcal{K}_m$ is not orthogonal. Therefore the analysis and bounds in [44] apply in particular to CMRH. More details of the theoretical analyses of the CMRH method, which we will not pursue them here, can be found in [27, 28]. Without considering restarted strategy, Sadok and Szyld [43] had stated that CMRH produces convergence curves which are very close to those of GMRES, but using fewer operations and storage; especially, they also presented new analysis which explains why CMRH has this good convergence behavior, see the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *([27, Theorem 4] and [43, Theorem 1]) Let $\boldsymbol{r}_m^G$ and $\boldsymbol{r}_m^c$ be the GMRES and CMRH residuals at the mth iteration beginning with the same initial residual $\boldsymbol{r}_0$ (e.g., $\boldsymbol{r}_0 = \boldsymbol{b}$), respectively. Then*

$$||\boldsymbol{r}_m^G|| \leq ||\boldsymbol{r}_m^c|| \leq \kappa(L_{m+1})||\boldsymbol{r}_m^G||, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\kappa(L_{m+1}) = ||L_{m+1}||||L_{m+1}^{\dagger}||$ is the condition number of L_{m+1}.

Algorithm 1 Restarted CMRH method with pivoting strategy

Choose the restarting frequency m and the initial guess $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ such that $\boldsymbol{r}_0 = \boldsymbol{b} - A\boldsymbol{x}_0$
Set $\boldsymbol{q} = [1, 2, \ldots n]^T$ and determine j_0 such that $|(\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}| = \|\boldsymbol{r}_0\|_\infty$
Set $\beta = (\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}$, $\boldsymbol{l}_1 = \boldsymbol{r}_0/\beta$ and $(\boldsymbol{q})_1 \leftrightarrow (\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}$, where $\leftrightarrow$ is used to swap contents.
for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, **do**
  Compute $\boldsymbol{u} = A\boldsymbol{l}_j$
  for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, j$, **do**
    $\check{h}_{i,j} = (\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_i}$
    $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u} - \check{h}_{i,j}\boldsymbol{l}_i$
  end for
  if $j < n$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$ **then**
    Determine $j_0 \in \{j+1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $|(\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}}| = \|(\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j+1:(\boldsymbol{q})_n}}\|_\infty$
    $\check{h}_{j+1,j} = (\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}}$, $\boldsymbol{l}_{j+1} = \boldsymbol{u}/\check{h}_{j+1,j}$; $(\boldsymbol{q})_{j+1} \leftrightarrow (\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}$
  else
    $\check{h}_{j+1,j} = 0$; Stop
  end if
end for
Collect the matrix $L_m = [\boldsymbol{l}_1, \boldsymbol{l}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{l}_m]$
Update $\boldsymbol{x}_m = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + L_m\boldsymbol{y}_m$, where $\boldsymbol{y}_m = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{C}^m} = \|\beta\boldsymbol{e}_1 - \check{H}_m\boldsymbol{y}\|_2$
Restart: if converged then stop; otherwise set $\boldsymbol{x}_0 := \boldsymbol{x}_m$ and goto step 1.

Theorem 2.1 helps us to understand how to describe the residual norms between CMRH and GMRES iterations when the condition number of L_m does not grow too fast. In addition, it is remarkable to mention that Duintjer Tebbens and Meurant [45] have recently further proved that any non-increasing residual norm history is possible for the CMRH method with any nonzero eigenvalues of the system matrix.

3 A shifted CMRH method

In this section, firstly, we review the derivation and properties of the restarted shifted GMRES solver, also we mention some further developments of the restarted shifted GMRES method when it is employed to solve the shifted linear systems (1.1). Secondly, according to the derivation of the restarted shifted GMRES method, we can derive the shifted variant of the restarted CMRH method for solving the shifted linear systems (1.1). Meanwhile, we also draw some conclusions about the restarted shifted CMRH method. At the end of this section, we will make some efforts on analyzing the algorithmic cost of the restarted shifted GMRES and the restarted shifted CMRH method, respectively.

3.1 Restarted shifted GMRES method

Firstly, we briefly recall the derivation of the restarted shifted GMRES method introduced in Ref. [38]. According to the shift-invariance property (1.3), the shifted Krylov subspace methods construct the Krylov basis vectors for just one selected *seed* system. Then the established basis can be reused for handling the rest systems dubbed the *add* systems. Let σ_{seed} be the shift parameter for the seed system. We also choose the initial guesses $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)}$ such that the initial residuals $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} := \boldsymbol{b} - A(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)}$ are collinear:

$$\boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} = \gamma_0^{(i)} \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(\sigma_{seed})}, \quad \gamma_0^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s. \tag{3.1}$$

Then, from the shift-invariance property (1.3), the approximate solutions $\boldsymbol{x}_m^{(i)}$ for all i are archived from affine spaces spanned by the initial guesses $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)}$ and the same Krylov subspace as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{x}_m^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} + V_m \boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)}, \qquad \boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} - A V_m \boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)}, \tag{3.2}$$

where V_m is an $n \times m$ matrix whose columns are the basis vectors of Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}_m(A(\sigma_{seed}), \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(\sigma_{seed})})$, and $\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Due to this reusability of the basis V_m, the shifted Krylov subspace methods can handle the shifted linear systems (1.1) at once without any additional matrix-vector products for *add* systems. In what follows, we suppose that the shift parameter for the seed system is zero, i.e. $\sigma_{seed} = 0$. Note that this assumption does not lose the generality, because if $\sigma_{seed} \neq 0$, then we can rewrite (1.1) by $A := A - \sigma_{seed} I$ and $\sigma_i := \sigma_i - \sigma_{seed}$.

As a direct generalization of the GMRES method to the shifted linear systems (1.1), the vectors $\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)}$ of the shifted GMRES method can be determined by the minimal residual condition as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{s} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \| \gamma_0^{(i)} \beta \boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) \boldsymbol{s} \|_2, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+1)\times m}$ is the upper Hessenberg matrix obtained from the matrix formula of the Arnoldi procedure, i.e.,

$$A(\sigma_i) V_m = V_{m+1} \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i), \qquad \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) := \hat{H}_m(\sigma_{seed}) - \sigma_i \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \boldsymbol{0} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+1)\times m}, \tag{3.4}$$

and $\beta = \| \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(\sigma_{seed})} \|_2$, $\boldsymbol{e}_1 = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$.

The shifted GMRES method can find efficient solutions based on the minimum residual condition for all linear systems in (1.1) with no additional matrix-vector products for the add systems. However, as noted in Section 1, the shifted GMRES method has difficulties due to the long-term vector recurrence based on the Arnoldi procedure as well as the GMRES method. Therefore the restart is need to employ for the shifted GMRES method. Unfortunately, it is known that the residual vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)}$ obtained from the minimum

residual condition are not collinear in general. Thus after restart, the shift-invariance property (1.3) will be unavailable for solving shifted linear systems. To remedy this difficulty, Frommer and Glässner proposed in 1998 the restarted shifted GMRES method [38], which is to impose the collinearity condition:

$$\boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)} = \gamma_m^{(i)} \boldsymbol{r}_m, \qquad \gamma_m^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C} \tag{3.5}$$

instead of the minimum residual condition for add systems, where $\boldsymbol{r}_m := \boldsymbol{r}_m^{(\sigma_{seed})}$ is the residual vector of the seed system and m is the restart frequency. We note that, for the seed system, the restarted shifted GMRES method enforces the minimum residual condition on the residual vector like the shifted GMRES method.

For the seed system, the vector $\boldsymbol{s}_m := \boldsymbol{s}_m^{(\sigma_{seed})}$ is evaluated by solving the following minimization problem:

$$\boldsymbol{s}_m = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{s}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \|\beta \boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m \boldsymbol{s}\|_2,$$

where $\hat{H}_m := \hat{H}_m(\sigma_{seed})$. The residual vector $\boldsymbol{r}_m$ can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{r}_m = V_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1} := \beta \boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m \boldsymbol{s}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}.$$

Thus, from the collinearity condition (3.5) for the add systems, it follows

$$\boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)} = \gamma_m^{(i)} \boldsymbol{r}_m \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\gamma_m^{(i)} = \gamma_0^{(i)}\beta \boldsymbol{e}_1 \tag{3.6}$$

via matrix identities of the well-known Arnoldi procedure; refer to [38] for details.

From the above relation, $\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)}$ and $\gamma_m^{(i)}$ can be read as the solution of the $(m+1)\times(m+1)$ linear systems, i.e.,

$$\left[\hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) \quad | \quad \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)} \\ \gamma_m^{(i)} \end{bmatrix} = \gamma_0^{(i)}\beta \boldsymbol{e}_1, \tag{3.7}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s$. The linear systems (3.7) are solved efficiently via using the Givens-rotation, because coefficient matrices of linear systems (3.7) have upper Hessenberg forms. In addition, the practical implementation of the restarted shifted GMRES method can be found in [38, Algorithm 2.3],

Lemma 3.1. [38, Lemma 2.4] *Let π_m be the residual polynomial of m iterations of the GMRES method for the seed system, i.e., $\boldsymbol{r}_m = \pi_m(A)\boldsymbol{r}_0$. Then (3.7) has a unique solution $(\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)}, \gamma_m^{(i)})$ iff $\pi_m(\sigma_i) \neq 0$.*

If the coefficient matrix A is positive definite, i.e., $(A\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}) > 0, \forall \boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$, and $\sigma_i > 0$ for all i, then the restarted shifted GMRES method converges for both seed and add systems for every restart frequency m, because in this case Eq. (3.7) has a unique solution [38, Theorem 3.3]. Moreover if the smallest σ_i is chosen as the seed shift, and the initial guesses $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)}$ of the first restart cycle are set at $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{0}$, then the add systems converge more rapidly than the seed system [38, Theorem 3.3]. Therefore in this case, we do not need to use the shift switching technique. In general, the seed system may converge faster than the add systems. In this case, for robust computation, we need to change the seed into one of the rest systems, this strategy is called the *seed switching technique* [46].

3.2 Restarted shifted CMRH method

As previously mentioned, the restarted CMRH method is a *non-optimal* Krylov subspace method, but it has some numerical advantages with compared to the restarted GMRES method. In addition, the CMRH method is established by using the *non-orthogonal* basis of Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}_m(A, \boldsymbol{r}_0)$. From the theoretical study and development of practice, many literatures have proved that the CMRH method is very close to the GMRES method and the QMR method; see [27, 43] for details. In fact, the derived process of the QMRIDR(s) method, which also belongs to the *non-optimal* Krylov subspace methods, is similar to the CMRH method. Then as we know, the shifted variants of GMRES, QMR and QMRIDR(s) have been successfully established in recent years, see [13, 19, 38], respectively. Moreover, inspect the derivations of these mentioned shifted variants, it can find that the orthogonality of the Krylov subspace basis is not essential to construct the shifted variants for solving Eq. (1.1). Therefore, it is natural to develop the shifted variant of CMRH for solving Eq. (1.1) with the help of deriving strategies for the shifted GMRES method and the CMRH method. The CMRH approximations is $\boldsymbol{x}_m^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} + L_m \boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)}$, where the vector $\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)}$ of the shifted CMRH method can be obtained by the following minimal residual condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|L_{m+1}^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} - A(\sigma_i) L_m \boldsymbol{y}^{(i)})\|_2 \\ &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|L_{m+1}^{\dagger}(\gamma_0^{(i)} \beta L_{m+1} \boldsymbol{e}_1 - L_{m+1} H_m(\sigma_i) \boldsymbol{y}^{(i)})\|_2 \\ &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \|(\gamma_0^{(i)} \beta \boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) \boldsymbol{y}^{(i)})\|_2, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where $\hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+1)\times m}$ is the upper Hessenberg matrix obtained from the matrix formula of the Hessenberg process [29, §§6.28-6.30], which requires less arithmetic work and storage than Arnoldi's process since it builds, at iteration m, a lower trapezoidal basis $\{\boldsymbol{l}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{l}_m\}$ such that $\boldsymbol{l}_i$ has $i-1$ components equal to zero and one component equal to one. Then we have the following similar identity of (2.1):

$$A(\sigma_i) L_m = L_{m+1} \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i), \qquad \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) := \hat{H}_m(\sigma_{seed}) - \sigma_i \begin{bmatrix} I \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(m+1)\times m}, \tag{3.9}$$

and $\beta = \|\boldsymbol{r}_0^{(\sigma_{seed})}\|_2, \boldsymbol{e}_1 = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$.

Like the shifted GMRES method, the shifted CMRH method can find suitable approximate solutions based on the minimum residual condition (3.8) for all linear systems in (1.1) with no matrix-vector products for add systems. However, as noted in Section 1, the shifted CMRH method has difficulties due to the long-term vector recurrence based on the Hessenberge process as well as the CMRH method [27, pp. 311-312]. Therefore the restart is required to apply to the shifted CMRH method. Unfortunately, it is known that the residual vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)}$ obtained from the minimum residual condition (3.8) are not collinear in general. Thus after restart, the shift-invariance property (1.3) cannot be

reused for solving shifted linear systems. To remedy this difficulty, we use the idea of Frommer and Glässner to impose the same collinearity condition (3.5) for deriving the restarted shifted CMRH method, instead of the minimum residual condition (3.8) for the add systems, where $\boldsymbol{r}_m := \boldsymbol{r}_m^{(\sigma_{seed})}$ is the residual vector of the seed system and m is the restart frequency. Furthermore, for the seed system, the restarted shifted CMRH method imposes the minimum residual condition (3.8) on the residual vector like the shifted CMRH method.

For practical implementation of the seed system, the vector $\boldsymbol{y}_m := \boldsymbol{y}_m^{(\sigma_{seed})}$ is computed by solving the following minimization problem:

$$\boldsymbol{y}_m = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathbb{R}^m} \|\beta\boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m\boldsymbol{y}\|_2, \qquad \beta = (\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}, \quad \boldsymbol{l}_1 = \boldsymbol{r}_0/\beta,$$

where $\hat{H}_m := \hat{H}_m(\sigma_{seed})$ and we determine j_0 such that $|(\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}| = \|\boldsymbol{r}_0\|_\infty$. The residual vector $\boldsymbol{r}_m$ can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{r}_m = L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1} := \beta\boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m\boldsymbol{s}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}.$$

Similarly, see the collinearity condition (3.5) and Eq. (2.3) for the add systems, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)} = \gamma_m^{(i)}\boldsymbol{r}_m \qquad &\Leftrightarrow \qquad \boldsymbol{b} - A(\sigma_i)(\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} + L_m\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)}) = \gamma_m^{(i)}L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \qquad \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} - A(\sigma_i)L_m\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} = L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\gamma_m^{(i)} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \qquad \gamma_0^{(i)}\boldsymbol{r}_0 - L_{m+1}\hat{H}_m(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} = L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\gamma_m^{(i)} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \qquad L_{m+1}(\hat{H}_m(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\gamma_m^{(i)}) = \gamma_0^{(i)}\boldsymbol{r}_0 \\
&\Leftrightarrow \qquad \hat{H}_m(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} + \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\gamma_m^{(i)} = \gamma_0^{(i)}\beta\boldsymbol{e}_1
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

using the matrix representation of the Hessenberge procedure; see [38] for details.

From the above relation, $\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)}$ and $\gamma_m^{(i)}$ can be written as the solution of the $(m+1)\times(m+1)$ linear systems, i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix}\hat{H}_m(\sigma_i) & | & \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} \\ \gamma_m^{(i)}\end{bmatrix} = \gamma_0^{(i)}\beta\boldsymbol{e}_1, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s. \tag{3.11}$$

The linear systems (3.11) are solved efficiently by using the Givens-rotation, because the coefficient matrices are upper Hessenberg matrices. In summary, the pseudo-codes of the restarted shifted CMRH method can read as the following Algorithm 2,

Similar to Lemma 3.1 of the restarted shifted GMRES method, we can also establish the follow conditions that the reduced linear system (3.11) in the restarted shifted CMRH method has the unique solution.

Lemma 3.2. *Let φ_m be the residual polynomial of m iterations of the CMRH method for the seed system, i.e., $\boldsymbol{r}_m = \varphi_m(A)\boldsymbol{r}_0$. Then (3.11) also has a unique solution $(\boldsymbol{s}_m^{(i)}, \gamma_m^{(i)})$ iff $\varphi_m(\sigma_i) \neq 0$.*

Algorithm 2 Restarted shifted CMRH method with pivoting strategy

1: Choose the restart frequency m and the initial guess $\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)}$ such that $\boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} = \gamma_0^{(i)}\boldsymbol{r}_0$, e.g. $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{0}$ (also implies that $\gamma_0^{(i)} = 1$)
2: Set $\boldsymbol{q} = [1, 2, \ldots n]^T$ and determine j_0 such that $|(\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}| = \|\boldsymbol{r}_0\|_\infty$
3: Set $\beta = (\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}$, $\boldsymbol{l}_1 = \boldsymbol{r}_0/\beta$ and $(\boldsymbol{q})_1 \leftrightarrow (\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}$, where $\leftrightarrow$ is used to swap contents.
4: **for** $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, **do**
5: Compute $\boldsymbol{u} = A\boldsymbol{l}_j$
6: **for** $k = 1, 2, \ldots, j$, **do**
7: $\check{h}_{k,j} = (\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_k}$
8: $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u} - \check{h}_{k,j}\boldsymbol{l}_k$
9: **end for**
10: **if** $j < n$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$ **then**
11: Determine $j_0 \in \{j+1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $|(\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}}| = \|(\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j+1}:(\boldsymbol{q})_n}\|_\infty$
12: $\check{h}_{j+1,j} = (\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}}$, $\boldsymbol{l}_{j+1} = \boldsymbol{u}/\check{h}_{j+1,j}$; $(\boldsymbol{q})_{j+1} \leftrightarrow (\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}$
13: **else**
14: $\check{h}_{j+1,j} = 0$; Stop
15: **end if**
16: **end for**
17: Define the $(m+1) \times m$ Hessenberg matrix $\hat{H}_m = \{\check{h}_{k,j}\}_{1 \le k \le m+1, 1 \le j \le m}$ and collect the matrix $L_m = [\boldsymbol{l}_1, \boldsymbol{l}_2, \ldots, \boldsymbol{l}_m]$
18: Compute $\boldsymbol{y}_m = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{C}^m} = \|\beta\boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m\boldsymbol{y}\|_2$ and set $\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1} = \beta\boldsymbol{e}_1 - \hat{H}_m\boldsymbol{y}_m$
19: $\boldsymbol{x}_m = \boldsymbol{x}_0 + L_m\boldsymbol{y}_m$, $\boldsymbol{r}_m = \boldsymbol{r}_0 - AL_m\boldsymbol{y}_m = L_{m+1}\boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}$
20: **for** $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s$ **do**
21: Solve $\left[\check{H}_m(\sigma_i) \mid \boldsymbol{u}_{m+1}\right] \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} \\ \gamma_m^{(i)} \end{bmatrix} = \gamma_0^{(i)}\beta\boldsymbol{e}_1$
22: $\boldsymbol{x}_m^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} + L_m\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)}$, $\boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} - AL_m\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)} = \gamma_m^{(i)}\boldsymbol{r}_m$
23: **end for**
24: Restart: if converged then stop; otherwise update $\boldsymbol{x}_0 := \boldsymbol{x}_m, \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} := \boldsymbol{x}_m^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{r}_0 := \boldsymbol{r}_m, \boldsymbol{r}_0^{(i)} := \boldsymbol{r}_m^{(i)}, \gamma_0^{(i)} := \gamma_m^{(i)}$ and goto step 2-3.

Proof. Since the detailed proof of the above lemma is almost the same as that of [38, Lemma 2.4], so we omit it here. □

Due to the non-orthogonal basis of the Krylov subspace, we cannot give a satisfactory convergence analysis for the restarted shifted CMRH method via similar ideas behind the shifted GMRES(m) method. On the other hand, we note that the minimal polynomial of GMRES [37,38] is the essential tool for analyzing the convergence of the shifted GMRES(m) method. Unfortunately, there is no standard minimal polynomial of CMRH which makes the residual norm archive the minimization. In conclusion, the theoretical conclusions about the convergence of shifted CMRH(m) are still unavailable now. However, from our numerical results in Section 5, we note that the cheap shifted CMRH(m) method often enjoys the similar convergence behaviors with the shifted GMRES(m) method, even the former one can handle some certain shifted linear systems in which the latter cannot.

In the end of this section, it is meaningful to analyze the algorithmic cost of shifted CMRH(m) and shifted GMRES(m). Following the idea introduced in our recent work [33], here, we shall analyze the computational cost of implementing the shifted CMRH(m) and shifted GMRES(m) methods. It is known from Section 3 and Ref. [38] that the difference of arithmetic operations between these two methods comes from processes in generating the basis vectors. Other operational requirements, like solving t_s linear subsystems defined as line 21 in Algorithm 2 and the update of $\boldsymbol{y}_m^{(i)}$, are similar for these two mentioned methods. Therefore, it makes sense to only consider the computational costs of the Hessenberg and Arnoldi processes which underpin the implementation of Algorithm 2 and shifted GMRES(m) method. Let us denote by Nz the number of nonzero entries of A in (1.1). The cost of an inner product is assumed to be $2n$ flops. Since the first $j-1$ elements of $\boldsymbol{l}_j$ are zero, then some arithmetic operations can be saved. For instance, the cost of updating the vector $\boldsymbol{l}_j$ (the j-loop in Algorithm 1) in the Hessenberg process reduces to $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{i} 2(n-(j-1)) = m(m+1)(n-(m-1)/3)$ flops instead of $2m(m+1)n$ flops in the Arnoldi process. If we neglect the cost of computing the maximum of the vector $\boldsymbol{l}_j$ in the Hessenberg process, then we obtain the number of operations per restart cycle (i.e., m steps) by the Arnoldi and Hessenberg procedures as Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison about algorithmic cost of the Arnoldi and Hessenberg procedures.

Process	Number of operations	Orthogonal basis
Arnoldi	$2mNz + 2m(m+1)n$	Yes
Hessenberg	$2mNz + m(m+1)n - \frac{1}{3}m(m-1)(m+1)$	No

In Table 1, m is the restarting frequency. Firstly, it is remarkable that the shifted CMRH(m) and shifted GMRES(m) methods have the similar implementations of lines 20-23 of Algorithm 2. As seen from Table 1, when the computational cost of (similar) lines 20-23 in both mentioned shifted iterative solvers are comparable, e.g., the required number of restarts is similar, the computational cost of the shifted CMRH(m) method

should be lower than that of the shifted GMRES(m) method, also refer to Section 5 for the further discussion.

4 Preconditioning for shifted linear systems

In order to accelerate the convergence of the iterative linear equation solver one normally uses a suitably chosen preconditioner. However, the suitable preconditioning for shifted linear systems is usually hard (even an open problem) in the field of scientific computing. For shifted problems this means that, in the case of right-preconditioning, the iterative solver (implicitly or explicitly) solves the system

$$(A - \sigma_i I)M(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{b}, \quad \boldsymbol{x}^{(i)} = M(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s. \tag{4.1}$$

The shifted Krylov subspace methods like the shifted CMRH algorithm that are described in the previous section all rely on the fact that the Krylov subspaces are shift invariant (1.3). Preconditioned shifted iterative methods should satisfy the same property, that is, all the Krylov subspaces for the preconditioned shifted systems must be the same. Without further assumptions on the preconditioners $M(\sigma_i)$ this is clearly not the case. So the question is how can we construct preconditioners $M(\sigma_i)$ that can be updated with shifted Krylov subspace methods. Let us suppose that a matrix M independent of σ_i is given, and that for any shift σ_i a matrix $M(\sigma_i)$ exists such that

$$\mathcal{K}_m(AM^{-1}, \boldsymbol{b}) = \mathcal{K}_m((A - \sigma_i I)M(\sigma_i)^{-1}, \boldsymbol{b}), \tag{4.2}$$

then a basis for the Krylov subspace $\mathcal{K}_m(AM^{-1}, \boldsymbol{b})$ also spans the Krylov subspaces $\mathcal{K}_m((A - \sigma_i I)M(\sigma_i)^{-1}, \boldsymbol{b})$ for the shifted problem. The matrix $M(\sigma_i)^{-1}$ is then the preconditioner that is applied to the shifted system. Although $M(\sigma_i)$ is not explicitly needed to generate a basis for $\mathcal{K}_m((A - \sigma_i I)M(\sigma_i)^{-1}, \boldsymbol{b})$, it is explicitly needed in the computation of the solution $\boldsymbol{x}^{(i)}$ of the unpreconditioned system from the solution $\boldsymbol{y}^{(i)}$ of the right-preconditioned system.

It is not hard to find that the condition (4.2) is satisfied if an σ_i dependent parameter η_i and a matrix M independent of σ_i exist such that

$$(A - \sigma_i I)M(\sigma_i)^{-1} = AM^{-1} - \eta_i I, \tag{4.3}$$

that is, such that the preconditioned shifted matrix can be rewritten as a shifted preconditioned matrix. We have to select M such that the matrices $M(\sigma_s)$ are efficient preconditioners for the shifted systems. We refer to [6, 11, 12, 33, 42] for learning some early established preconditioning techniques and next discuss a recent preconditioning framework introduced in [20].

4.1 Flexible (or nested) preconditioning techniques

Although the polynomial preconditioner for shifted linear systems (1.1) had been proved that it is particularly suitable, we must know that polynomial preconditioners

are not very popular in general. So we still need to search other efficient preconditioning techniques, the recent flexible preconditioning [9, 47] draws our attention to solving the shifted linear systems (1.1). Flexible preconditioning of an iterative Krylov subspace method means that a different preconditioner can be exploited in every iteration j, see [48, 49] and our recent work [34] where flexible GMRES and flexible CMRH has been introduced for preconditioning of non-Hermitian linear systems $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$, respectively. For flexible preconditioning of shifted linear systems, we require a greatly similar relation to (4.3), namely,

$$(A - \sigma_i I)P_j(\sigma_i)^{-1} = \alpha_j(\sigma_i)AP_j^{-1} - \beta_j(\sigma_i)I, \tag{4.4}$$

where the parameters α_j and β_j depend on the shifts, and different preconditioners $P_j, P_j(\sigma)$ are used at every iteration j. Note that the right-hand side in (4.4) is again a shifted linear system and, therefore, the shift-invariance property is preserved by the flexible preconditioner, refer to [9, 47]. Since in a practical algorithm, the preconditioner is always directly applied to a vector $\boldsymbol{v}_j$, equation (4.4) becomes:

$$(A - \sigma_i I)P_j(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j = \alpha_j(\sigma_i)AP_j^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j - \beta_j(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{v}_j. \tag{4.5}$$

We will next determine how α_j and β_j have to be chosen such that (4.4) and (4.5) hold. It assumes the preconditioning to be done by a multi-shift Krylov subspace method itself (the inner solver) which implies that

$$\boldsymbol{x}_j = P_j^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j, \qquad \boldsymbol{z}_j^{(i)} = P_j(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j,$$

are computed via a truncated multi-shift Krylov subspace solver. More precisely, the vectors $\boldsymbol{z}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{z}_j(\sigma_i)$ denote the approximate (truncated) solution of the linear systems with coefficient matrix A and $(A - \sigma_i I)$, respectively, and right-hand sides $\boldsymbol{v}_j$. Therefore, the corresponding (inner) residuals are given by,

$$\boldsymbol{r}_j = \boldsymbol{v}_j - A\boldsymbol{z}_j = \boldsymbol{v}_j - AP_j^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j, \tag{4.6}$$

$$\boldsymbol{r}_j^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{v}_j - (A - \sigma_i I)\boldsymbol{z}_j^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{v}_j - (A - \sigma_i I)P_j(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j. \tag{4.7}$$

We require the residuals (4.6)-(4.7) of the inner method to be collinear, i.e.

$$\exists \gamma_j^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C} : \qquad \gamma_j^{(i)}\boldsymbol{r}_j = \boldsymbol{r}_j^{(i)}. \tag{4.8}$$

Note that the collinearity factor $\gamma_j^{(i)}$ will be variable at every iteration j and for every shift σ_i. Moreover, relation (4.8) is not a very strong assumption since for example the shifted FOM [14–17], shifted BiCGStab [11, 12], shifted BiCRStab [23], restarted shifted GMRES [38, 39, 42], shifted IDR(s) [18, 20] and restarted shifted Hessenberg methods [33] lead to collinear residuals. With this assumption, α_j and β_j can be determined from (4.5)

by using the collinearity relation (4.8) as the following calculation shows:

$$\begin{array}{lll} & (A-\sigma_i I)\boldsymbol{z}_j^{(i)} & = \alpha_j A\boldsymbol{z}_j - \beta_j \boldsymbol{v}_j \\ \Leftrightarrow & \boldsymbol{v}_j - (A-\sigma_i I)\boldsymbol{z}_j^{(i)} & = \alpha_j \boldsymbol{v}_j - \alpha_j A\boldsymbol{z}_j + (1-\alpha_j+\beta_j)\boldsymbol{v}_j \\ \Leftrightarrow & \boldsymbol{r}_j^{(i)} & = \underbrace{\alpha_j}_{\equiv\gamma_j^{(i)}}\boldsymbol{r}_j + \underbrace{(1-\alpha_j+\beta_j)}_{\equiv 0}\boldsymbol{v}_j \end{array}$$

Thus, with (4.5) the residuals are collinear if

$$a_j = \gamma_j^{(i)}, \qquad \beta_j = \alpha_j - 1 = \gamma_j^{(i)} - 1$$

are chosen in every (outer) iteration $1 \le j \le m$. One can show the following relation,

$$(A-\sigma_i I)\boldsymbol{z}_j^{(i)} = \gamma_j^{(i)} A\boldsymbol{z}_j - (\gamma_j^{(i)} - 1)\boldsymbol{v}_j, \tag{4.9}$$

or, in terms of the flexible preconditioners P_j and $P_j(\sigma_i)$, the following holds:

$$(A-\sigma_i I)P_j(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j = \left(\gamma_j^{(i)} AP_j^{-1} - (\gamma_j^{(i)} - 1)I\right)\boldsymbol{v}_j, \qquad 1 \le j \le m.$$

Here it remarked that the factors α_j and β_j indeed depend on σ_i since the collinearity factor $\gamma_j^{(i)}$ is different for every shift.

4.2 Nested Hessenberg-FCMRH for shifted linear systems

Based on the strategy of Baumann and van Gijzen proposed in [20], We now present a special case of the nested Krylov framework of Section 4.1, namely a version where shifted Hessenberg (`sHessen`) [33] is used as inner preconditioner and flexible CMRH (`FCMRH`) is used as an outer Krylov iteration. Our recent flexible CMRH has been introduced by [34] for unshifted systems $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$ and provides a different preconditioner P_j in the j-th outer iteration. The Hessenberg relation (2.1) therein extends to,

$$AZ_m = L_{m+1}\underline{H}_m, \tag{4.10}$$

where at step $1 \le j \le m$ the (flexible) preconditioning $\boldsymbol{z}_j = P_j^{-1}\boldsymbol{l}_j$ is carried out, and $Z_m = [\boldsymbol{z}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_m]$. Note that (4.10) is formulated for the unshifted case and that one column of relation (4.10) yields,

$$A\boldsymbol{z}_j = L_{m+1}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j,$$

which we will use next in order to determine the shifted Hessenberg matrix. Hence, we suppose that the preconditioner $P_j(\sigma)$ is equivalent to a truncated `sHessen` inner iteration with collinear factor $\gamma_j^{(i)}$ of the residuals according to (20). From the following calculation

$$\begin{array}{lll} & (A-\sigma_i I)P_j(\sigma_i)^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}_j & = L_{m+1}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j^{(i)}, \\ \Leftrightarrow & \gamma_j^{(i)} A\boldsymbol{z}_j - (\gamma_j^{(i)} - 1)\boldsymbol{v}_j & = L_{m+1}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j^{(i)}, \\ \Leftrightarrow & \gamma_j^{(i)} L_{m+1}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j - L_{m+1}(\gamma_j^{(i)} - 1)\underline{\boldsymbol{e}}_j & = L_{m+1}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j^{(i)}, \\ \Leftrightarrow & L_{m+1}\left(\gamma_j^{(i)}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j - (\gamma_j^{(i)} - 1)\underline{\boldsymbol{e}}_j\right) & = L_{m+1}\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j^{(i)}, \end{array}$$

we can conclude the j-th column of the shifted Hessenberg matrix to be,

$$\underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j^{(i)} = \gamma_j^{(i)} \underline{\boldsymbol{h}}_j - (\gamma_j^{(i)} - 1)\underline{\boldsymbol{e}}_j, \quad 1 \le j \le m, \tag{4.11}$$

with $\underline{\boldsymbol{e}}_j$ being the j-th unit vector of $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Aligning the columns of m outer iterations together, yields the following formula for the shifted Hessenberg matrix,

$$\underline{H}_m(\sigma_i) = (\underline{H}_m - \underline{I}_m)\Gamma_m^{(i)} + \underline{I}_m, \tag{4.12}$$

where $\underline{I}_m$ is the $m \times m$ identity matrix with an extra column of zeros attached and $\Gamma_m^{(i)}$ is a diagonal matrix with the collinearity factors on the diagonal, i.e.

$$\Gamma_m^{(i)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1^{(i)} & & & \\ & \gamma_2^{(i)} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \gamma_m^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m}. \tag{4.13}$$

Note that for $\sigma_i = 0$, the shifted Hessenberg matrix (4.12) reduces to the plain Hessenberg matrix, $\underline{H}_m(0) = \underline{H}_m$, because in this case the collinearity factors are all equal to one and, hence, $\Gamma_m^{(0)} = I$. In addition, it is not hard to note that the Hessenberg-FCMRH nested Krylov method is very close to the FOM-FGMRES nested Krylov subspace method presented in [20]. Finally, our new nested Krylov subspace (dubbed `Hessen-FCMRH`) method for solving shifted linear systems is summarized in Algorithm 4.

We find that in the same way as in flexible CMRH for the unshifted case, extra storage is required because the matrices $Z_j^{(i)}$ which span the solution space for every shifted problem need to be stored. This is in fact a drawback of the flexible CMRH method that has already been pointed out by [34] and applies here for every shift. By the way, we think that the other shifted Krylov subspace methods (such as the shifted BiCGStab(ℓ), shifted IDR(s), shifted BiCRStab, shifted GPBiCG, and shifted Hessenberg methods) can be employed as a inner preconditioner like `sHessen` at the line 5 of Algorithm 3.

5 Numerical experiments

Far from being exhaustive, in this section, some numerical examples will be carried out. We present numerical results to demonstrate the performances of the restarted shifted CMRH method (abbreviated as `sCMRH(`m`)`) for solving the shifted linear systems, which arise from some real problems. Meanwhile, we also compare our proposed method with the restarted shifted GMRES (`sGMRES(`m`)`) method, shifted TFQMR (`sTFQMR`) method[3], and shifted QMRIDR(s) (`sQMRIDR(`s`)`), in which the (quasi-)minimal residual norm per

[3]If no look-ahead strategies are employed, we find that the performances of `sTFQMR` [13] are not promising in our practical implementations, so we omit all the results of `sTFQMR` in this section.

Algorithm 3 `FCMRH` method with pivoting and a `sHessen` preconditioner for Eq. (1.1)

Choose the initial guess $\boldsymbol{x}_0 = \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(\sigma_i)} = \boldsymbol{0}$, then $\boldsymbol{r}_0 = \boldsymbol{b}$
Set $\boldsymbol{q} = [1, 2, \ldots n]^T$ and determine j_0 such that $|(\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}| = \|\boldsymbol{r}_0\|_\infty$
Set $\beta = (\boldsymbol{r}_0)_{j_0}$, $\boldsymbol{l}_1 = \boldsymbol{r}_0/\beta$ and $(\boldsymbol{q})_1 \leftrightarrow (\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}$, where $\leftrightarrow$ is used to swap contents.
for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, **do**
  Preconditioning: $\boldsymbol{z}_j^{(\sigma_i)} = \texttt{sHessen}(A - \sigma_i I, \boldsymbol{l}_j)$
  Compute $\gamma_j^{(\sigma_i)}$ according to the similar formula of *Eq. (3.9)* in [20]
  Compute $\boldsymbol{u} = A\boldsymbol{z}_j^{(0)}$ (hint: $\sigma_i = 0$)
  for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, j$, **do**
    $\check{h}_{k,j} = (\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_k}$
    $\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u} - \check{h}_{k,j}\boldsymbol{l}_k$
  end for
  if $j < n$ and $\boldsymbol{u} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$ **then**
    Determine $j_0 \in \{j+1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $|(\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}}| = \|(\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j+1:(\boldsymbol{q})_n}}\|_\infty$
    $\check{h}_{j+1,j} = (\boldsymbol{u})_{(\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}}$, $\boldsymbol{l}_{j+1} = \boldsymbol{u}/\check{h}_{j+1,j}$; $(\boldsymbol{q})_{j+1} \leftrightarrow (\boldsymbol{q})_{j_0}$
  else
    $\check{h}_{j+1,j} = 0$; Stop
  end if
  // Loop over shifted systems:
  for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s$ **do**
    Define the matrix $Z_j^{(i)} = [\boldsymbol{z}_1^{(i)}, \boldsymbol{z}_2^{(i)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{z}_j^{(i)}]$
    Set up $\check{H}_j(\sigma_i)$ according to Eq. (4.12)
    Solve $\boldsymbol{y}_j^{(\sigma_i)} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{C}^j} \|\beta \boldsymbol{e}_1 - H_j(\sigma_i)\boldsymbol{y}\|$ with $\boldsymbol{e}_1 = [1, 0, \ldots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{j+1}$
    $\boldsymbol{x}_j^{(\sigma_i)} = \boldsymbol{x}_0^{(\sigma_i)} + Z_j^{(\sigma_i)}\boldsymbol{y}_j^{(\sigma_i)}$
  end for
end for

iteration step is considered. Then, some numerical results about the nested Krylov subspace solvers based on both the CMRH and Hessenberg methods are reported for handling several examples, also against the recent framework of nested iterative solvers proposed in [20]. We make comparisons in two main aspects: number of matrix-vector products (abbreviated as `MVPs`), CPU consuming time in seconds (referred to as `CPU`) except the numerical comparisons presented in Experiment 5.

All the numerical experiments have been carried out with machine precision 10^{-16} in double precision floating point arithmetic in MATLAB R2014a with a Windows 7 (64 bit) PC-Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-3740 CPU 3.20 GHz, 8 GB of RAM. Unless indicated otherwise, the vector of right-hand side $\boldsymbol{b} = ones(n, 1)$, where the *ones* function generated a $n \times 1$ vector with all one entries. In all these experiments, the initial guesses were taken as $\boldsymbol{x}_0^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{0}$ and stopping criterion was either $\|\boldsymbol{r}_k^{(i)}\|/\|\boldsymbol{b}\| < 10^{-8}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t_s$ or when this condition of the relative residual was not satisfied within Max_{mvps} iterations for all

linear systems (denoted by ‡). We specify that it is not necessary to explicitly compute the residuals of *add* systems due to the collinearity.

5.1 General problems

All test matrices in this experiment are from the University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection [50]. For the sake of convenience, properties of test problems (matrix size and number of nonzero elements etc.) and their names Σ_ℓ ($\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, 8$) are listed in Table 2. Moreover, we set shift parameters $\sigma_j = -j/10000$ for test problems (Σ_1, Σ_4, Σ_5, Σ_6, and Σ_8); and then $\sigma_j = -(8+j)/200000$, $\sigma_j = -(179+j)/20000$, and $\sigma_j = -j/20000$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$) for the test problem Σ_2, Σ_3, and Σ_7, respectively. The first linear system $(A - \sigma_1 I)\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{b}$ was used as the *seed* system. In addition, here we choose the restart frequency $m = 40$. The numerical results for different shifted iterative solvers for targeted linear systems (1.1) are reported in the following Table 3 and Fig. 1. Meanwhile, we set $Max_{mvps} = 6000$ in this experiment.

Table 2: Set and characteristics of test problems in Example 1 (listed in increasing matrix size).

Index	Matrix	Size	Field	$nnz(A)$
Σ_1	poisson3Da	13,514	Computational fluid dynamics	352,762
Σ_2	epb1	14,734	Thermal problem	95,053
Σ_3	waveguide3D	21,036	Electromagnetics problem	303,468
Σ_4	kim1	38,415	2D/3D problem	933,195
Σ_5	poisson3Db	85,623	Computational fluid dynamics	2,374,949
Σ_6	vfem	93,476	Electromagnetics problem	1,434,636
Σ_7	matrix-new_3	125,329	Semiconductor device problem	893,984
Σ_8	FEM_3D_thermal2	147,900	Thermal problem	3,489,300

Table 3: Results of different solvers for Experiment 1 with $m = 40$ in terms of MVPs and CPU.

	sGMRES(m)		sCMRH(m)		sQMRIDR(1)		sQMRIDR(2)		sQMRIDR(4)	
Index	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU
Σ_1	320	0.614	360	0.543	250	0.633	225	0.617	193	0.764
Σ_2	1160	1.687	1680	1.511	1410	2.255	952	1.907	741	2.516
Σ_3	480	3.480	560	2.848	480	3.176	414	3.614	349	4.527
Σ_4	2000	26.832	1680	14.967	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡	‡
Σ_5	600	9.142	680	7.711	592	10.605	421	9.759	382	13.806
Σ_6	240	5.753	280	4.121	379	10.709	257	10.563	207	13.723
Σ_7	120	1.183	120	0.673	238	3.626	153	3.324	109	3.937
Σ_8	520	14.197	560	8.367	607	16.848	469	17.885	428	24.681

The numerical results shown in Table 3 are the number of matrix-vector products and the computation time in seconds (in parentheses) for `sCMRH(`m`)`, `sGMRES(`m`)`, and `sQMRIDR(`s`)` ($s = 1, 2, 4$). From Table 3, some observations are made as follows. Methods except `sQMRIDR(`s`)` (for Problem Π_4) have solved all linear systems within the maximum iterations. As the analysis between `sCMRH(`m`)` and `sGMRES(`m`)`, the first mentioned of two is always cheaper than the latter in terms of CPU time elapsed, although `sCMRH(`m`)` often needs more `MVPs` than those required by `sGMRES(`m`)` for reaching the convergence criterion. For all test problems that could be solved, `sCMRH(`m`)` took the minimal computation time even with more matrix-vector products. The cost analysis in Section 3 can explain the different CPU time elapsed between `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sCMRH(`m`)`. Moreover, since there are other two kinds of operations, inner products and vector updates, besides the matrix-vector products in all these methods. The computation time taken by the inner products and vector updates corresponding to one matrix-vector product of `sQMRIDR(`s`)` is more than that of `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sCMRH(`m`)`. Especially, for `sQMRIDR(2)` and `sQMRIDR(4)`, that is also why they always require the less number of matrix-vector products but more CPU time elapsed to reach the convergence criterion.

In order to see the convergence changes more clearly, relative residual histories of five shifted Krylov subspace solvers corresponding to each linear system are also presented in Fig. 1. The vertical axis shows the $\log_{10}$ of relative residual norms, and the horizontal axis represents the number of matrix-vector products. We find that in this case for `sGMRES(`m`)`, the add systems converge more rapidly than the seed systems. This phenomenon conforms with the convergence analysis of `sGMRES(`m`)` [38]. On the other hand, it seems that `sCMRH(`m`)` can reach the similar convergence behavior, although we cannot theoretically prove the convergence of `sCMRH(`m`)`. Furthermore, it remarked that the final solutions obtained from `sGMRES(`m`)` are most accurate than those from other shifted iterative solvers. Meanwhile, the final solutions obtained from `sCMRH(`m`)` are also not bad. In total, we also conclude that `sCMRH(`m`)` is considerably competitive with compared to other shifted Krylov subspace methods.

5.2 Quantum chromodynamics applications

In this subsection, we performed several experiments with sets of matrices coming from a lattice quantum chromodynamics (QCD) application downloaded from the University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection [50]. The set of matrices is a collection including seven $49,152 \times 49,152$ complex matrices, i.e., `conf5_4-8x8-05`, `conf5_4-8x8-10`, `conf5_4-8x8-15`, `conf5_4-8x8-20`, `conf6_0-8x8-20`, `conf6_0-8x8-30`, and `conf6_0-8x8-80`. Here we orderly denote these seven test matrices as indices Π_i ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, 7$). For each matrix D from the collection, there exists some critical value κ_c such that for $\frac{1}{\kappa_c} < \frac{1}{\kappa} < \infty$, the matrix $A = \frac{1}{\kappa}I - D$ is real-positive. For each D, we took $A = (\frac{1}{\kappa_c} + 10^{-3})I - D$ as our base matrix. As described in [50], the matrices D are discretizations of the Dirac operator used in numerical simulation of quark behavior at different physical temperatures. In our numerical experiments, one set of shifted values



Fig. 1: Relative residual histories of different iterative solvers for test problem Σ_1 in Table 3.

$\sigma_j \in \mathcal{I} = -\{.001, .002, .003, .04, .05, .06, .07\}$ for shifted systems is considered. The first linear system $(A - \sigma_1 I)\boldsymbol{x}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{b}$ was used as the *seed* system. The numerical results of different shifted iterative solvers for handling the shifted linear systems (1.1) are displayed in Table 4. Morover, we set $Max_{mvps} = 5000$ in this experiment.

Table 4: Results of different solvers for Experiment 2 with $m = 40$ in terms of `MVPs` and `CPU`.

	`sGMRES(`m`)`		`sCMRH(`m`)`		`sQMRIDR(1)`		`sQMRIDR(2)`		`sQMRIDR(4)`	
`Index`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`
Π_1	1120	20.598	1560	21.179	841	19.084	760	23.010	665	33.892
Π_2	880	17.056	1120	15.835	763	17.384	678	22.063	647	33.883
Π_3	720	14.409	880	12.384	714	16.491	633	20.719	596	31.306
Π_4	640	12.138	800	10.541	731	16.822	706	21.074	629	32.577
Π_5	640	11.328	840	11.065	593	12.690	477	15.796	432	22.717
Π_6	840	15.545	1200	16.036	539	11.912	456	14.350	399	21.393
Π_7	680	11.911	840	11.039	576	13.018	472	14.924	409	21.648

In Table 4, we want to point out the CPU time and `MVPs` that are required in order to solve all seven shifted systems up to a relative tolerance of 10^{-8}. When the number of matrix-vector products of `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sCMRH(`m`)` is close, then `sCMRH(`m`)` can save the algorithmic cost with regard to that required by `sGMRES(`m`)` except the cases of Problems Π_1 and Π_6. Furthermore, `sQMRIDR(1)` and `sQMRIDR(`s`)` (except $s = 4$, in fact, the large s is often not recommended from Ref. [19]) are more efficient than other shifted Krylov subspace methods for Problems Π_1 and Π_6, respectively, in terms of CPU time elapsed. Although the number of matrix-vector products required by `sQMRIDR(`s`)` is smaller than those required by `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sCMRH(`m`)`, the CPU time elapsed is still expensive. This is because `sQMRIDR(`s`)` needs more number of inner products, vector updates and solving small linear system with the size $\mathcal{O}(s^2)$ than those required by `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sCMRH(`m`)`.

For observing the convergence changes more clearly, relative residual histories of shifted Krylov subspace solvers corresponding to each linear system are also plotted in Fig. 2. The vertical axis shows the $\log_{10}$ of relative residual norms, and the horizontal axis represents the number of matrix-vector products. We find that in this case for `sGMRES(`m`)`, the add systems converge more rapidly than the seed systems. This result accords with the convergence analysis of `sGMRES(`m`)` [38]. On the other hand, it seems that `sCMRH(`m`)` can reach the similar convergence behavior as `sGMRES(`m`)`, although we cannot theoretically prove the convergence of `sCMRH(`m`)`. Moreover, it also noted that the final solutions obtained from `sCMRH(`m`)` are most accurate than those from other shifted iterative solvers. Additionally, the final solutions obtained from `sGMRES(`m`)` are still better than those from `sQMRIDR(`s`)`. In short, we also conclude that `sCMRH(`m`)` is still promising with compared to other shifted Krylov subspace methods.



Fig. 2: Relative residual histories of different iterative solvers for test problem Π_1 in Table 4.

5.3 PageRank applications

During recent years, with the booming development of the Internet, Web search engines have become a very essential tool for Web information retrieval. Due to the use of its efficient PageRank algorithm [51], Google is one the most popular and powerful Web search engine. In this experiment, we still consider a sequence of test problems from PageRank. In a practical setting, it may be required to solve the PageRank problem with multiple damping factors. Each web link structure can be represented by its adjacency matrix $G = (g_{ik})$, i.e., if there is a link from page k to page i, $g_{ij} = 1$; otherwise, $g_{ij} = 0$. Based on this adjacency matrix G, a transition matrix P is constructed as

$$P_{ik} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell=1}^{n} g_{\ell,k}}, & g_{ik} = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

Mathematically, our model test problem can be rewritten as

$$(I - \alpha_j P^T)\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b} \Leftrightarrow (P^T - \frac{1}{\alpha_j} I)\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{b}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{y} = -\alpha_j \boldsymbol{x}$, refer to [10] for details. In our experiments we selected test matrices from the University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection. The characteristics of the Web matrices G used in our experiments are listed in Table 5. Here we need to set $\boldsymbol{b} = \texttt{ones}(\texttt{n}, 1)/n$ and choose the damping factors $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{I} = \{0.92, 0.94, 0.96, 0.98, 0.99\}$. Note that when the damping factors are close to 1, the problems are more difficult to solve due to a clustering of eigenvalues close to zero in the spectrum of the coefficient matrix. The first linear system $(P^T - \frac{1}{\alpha_1} I)\boldsymbol{y}^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{b}$ was used as the *seed* system. To make sure the convergence of `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sCMRH(`m`)`, we use the *shift switching technique* introduced in Section 3.1 via switching the seed system at every restart cycle to the latest system, which has the largest residual norm.

Table 5: Set and characteristics of the matrix G in Experiment 3 (listed in increasing matrix size).

Index	Matrix	Size	Description	$nnz(A)$
Π_1	`soc-Slashdot0811`	77,360	Slashdot social network	905,468
Π_2	`soc-Slashdot0902`	82,168	Slashdot social network	948,464
Π_3	`amazon0302`	262,111	Amazon product co-purchasing network	1,234,877
Π_4	`amazon0312`	400,727	Amazon product co-purchasing network	3,200,440
Π_5	`amazon0505`	410,236	Amazon product co-purchasing network	3,356,824
Π_6	`amazon-2008`	735,323	Book similarity network, Amazon	5,158,388
Π_7	`flickr`	820,878	2005 crawl of flickr.com	9,837,214

In Table 6, we report the CPU elapsed time and `MVPs` that are employed for solving all seven shifted linear systems up to convergence criteria. First of all, since the problem of

Table 6: Results of different solvers for Experiment 3 with $m = 40$ in terms of MVPs and CPU.

	sGMRES(m)		sCMRH(m)		sQMRIDR(1)		sQMRIDR(2)		sQMRIDR(4)	
Index	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU	MVPs	CPU
Π_1	160	1.257	160	0.855	108	1.158	102	1.421	88	2.052
Π_2	120	0.905	160	0.883	83	0.967	89	1.380	88	2.204
Π_3	240	7.821	280	4.176	265	9.242	234	11.441	211	15.401
Π_4	240	13.881	280	8.126	274	16.084	212	17.179	205	24.619
Π_5	240	13.349	240	6.907	224	15.227	215	20.006	202	27.037
Π_6	200	20.685	240	12.952	226	25.088	207	30.946	179	40.254
Π_7	200	25.112	240	17.341	221	33.244	186	35.521	177	48.356

choosing damping factor α_j was curiously overlooked in the first papers about PageRank: yet, not only PageRank changes significantly when α_j is modified [52], we choose the seed system involving $\alpha_1 = 0.92$ corresponding to a well-conditioned problem, so we find that for both sGMRES(m) and sCMRH(m) the seed system indeed converges faster than the add systems with other lager $\alpha_j (j \neq 1)$. To ensure the reliable computation for all shifted linear systems, so we employ the shift switch technique mentioned in Section 3.1 during each restarting cycle of both sGMRES(m) and sCMRH(m). As seen from Table 6, it notes that sGMRES(m) and sCMRH(m) require the similar number of matrix-vector products, but the latter one again uses the less CPU time elapsed than sGMRES(m). From the CPU time elapsed perspective, the performance of sQMRIDR(s) is not promising for solving shifted linear systems, because it fails to use less (even more) MVPs than both sGMRES(m) and sCMRH(m). As mentioned in Ref. [19], for large $s(= 4)$, however, the additional storage requirements may become prohibitive if many shifted systems have to be solved. So that is reason that sQMRIDR(4) is not competitive with other shifted iterative solvers. In summary, it remarked that the proposed sCMRH(m) method is still attractive for handling shifted linear systems in terms of CPU time elapsed.

5.4 Time fractional differential equations

Applications of fractional differential equations (FDEs) have been found in physical, biological, geological and financial systems, and in the recent years there are intensive studies on them, see e.g. [53, 54] for this topic. Here we consider the benchmark problem coming from the 3D time-fractional convection-diffusion-reaction equation, namely

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial^\gamma u}{\partial t^\gamma} = \epsilon \triangle u - \vec{\beta} \cdot \nabla u + ru, & (x, y, z) \in \Omega = (0, 1)^3, \ t \in [0, T], \\ u(x, y, z, t) = 0, & (x, y, z) \in \partial\Omega, \ t \in [0, T], \\ u(x, y, z, 0) = x(1 - x)y(1 - y)z(1 - z), & (x, y, z) \in \bar{\Omega}. \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

This example can be regarded as a modification of the third example in Ref. [19]. The physical parameters are chosen as follows: $\epsilon = 1$ (diffusion), $\vec{\beta} = (0/\sqrt{5}, 250/\sqrt{5}, 500/\sqrt{5})^T$

(convection), and $r = 400$ (reaction). In order to solve Eqs. (5.3) numerically, we start by discretizing the spatial domain into uniformly spaced grid points. Then the finite difference approximation (grid size: $h = 0.025$) with the natural ordering results in a system of FDEs as following form

$$\frac{d^{\gamma}\boldsymbol{u}}{dt^{\gamma}} = A\boldsymbol{u}(t), \qquad \boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{u}_0, \tag{5.4}$$

where the size of A is about 60,000. Since the spatial finite difference methods for (5.3) lead to the system of FDEs with the form (5.4), where $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the vector containing the unknown solution. It is a well-known result [2–4] that, for $0 < \gamma < 1$, the true solution of this problem can be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{u}(t) = e_{\gamma,1}(t; A)\boldsymbol{u}_0, \quad \text{and} \quad e_{\gamma,1}(t; A) = t^{1-1}E_{\gamma,1}(t^{\gamma}A) = E_{\gamma,1}(t^{\gamma}A), \tag{5.5}$$

where $E_{\gamma,1}(z)$ is the Mittag-Leffler (ML) function [4, 53]

$$E_{\gamma,1}(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{\Gamma(\gamma k + 1)}, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

In light of (5.5), to compute the solution $\boldsymbol{u}(t)$, we have to approximate the product of the matrix ML function $E_{\gamma,1}(t^{\gamma}A)$ with the vector $\boldsymbol{u}_0$, which is the major computational cost for this problem. The numerical evaluation of matrix functions $E_{\gamma,1}(t^{\gamma}A)\boldsymbol{u}_0$ has recently gained new interest, as shown by the recent spread of literature [2–4] in this field. Moreover, These numerical evaluation method based on Carathéodory-Fejér approximation [55] for $E_{\gamma,1}(t^{\gamma}A)\boldsymbol{u}_0$ (we set $t = 1$) can be represented as

$$E_{\gamma,1}(A)\boldsymbol{u}_0 = f_{\nu}(A)\boldsymbol{u}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} w_j(z_j I - A)^{-1}\boldsymbol{u}_0, \tag{5.6}$$

where w_j and z_j are quadrature weights and nodes. So in the implementation of the procedure (5.6), we need to solve a sequence of shifted linear systems, which are similar to $(-A + z_j I)\boldsymbol{x}^{(j)} = \boldsymbol{u}_0$, $z_j \in \mathbb{C}$. The linear system $-A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{u}_0$ was used as the *seed* system. Under this condition, it remarked that the procedure of establishing the Krylov subspace for solving shifted linear systems does not involve the complex operations. Then the results about performances of different shifted Krylov subspace methods are reported in Table 7.

In Table 7, we report the CPU elapsed time and `MVPs` that are employed for solving five different shifted linear systems up to convergence criteria. First of all, we mention that these five sequences of shifted linear systems can have the same seed systems with the coefficient matrix $-A$. Meanwhile, we also consider to investigate the performances of different iterative solvers for shifted linear systems with the same seed systems but different number of (various) shifts. So that is why the number of matrix-vector products needed by different iterative solvers almost does not change in Table 7. Although

Table 7: Results of different solvers for Experiment 4 with $m = 40$ in terms of `MVPs` and `CPU`.

	`sGMRES`(m)		`sCMRH`(m)		`sQMRIDR(1)`		`sQMRIDR(2)`		`sQMRIDR(4)`	
(γ, ν)	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`
$(0.2, 6)$	800	5.724	1000	4.412	315	7.122	185	6.591	149	9.572
$(0.4, 8)$	800	5.726	1000	4.466	315	9.931	185	8.715	149	12.079
$(0.6, 10)$	800	5.732	1000	4.554	315	10.955	185	9.933	149	14.173
$(0.8, 10)$	800	5.751	1000	4.573	315	10.938	185	9.941	149	14.562
$(0.9, 12)$	800	5.772	1000	4.627	317	13.165	185	11.686	149	18.078

Table 8: Results of different Krylov solvers for Experiment 4 with $m = 40$, $\gamma = 0.8$ and $\nu = 10$ in terms of `MVPs` and `CPU`.

	`sGMRES`(m)		`sCMRH`(m)		`sQMRIDR(1)`		`sQMRIDR(2)`		`sQMRIDR(4)`	
$(h,\ r)$	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`	`MVPs`	`CPU`
$(\frac{1}{50}, 400)$	‡	‡	1360	10.23	289	22.74	200	24.51	164	32.78
$(\frac{1}{50}, 500)$	‡	‡	1400	10.61	295	23.04	215	25.84	168	33.48
$(\frac{1}{80}, 400)$	‡	‡	1640	62.70	357	142.10	275	151.66	229	203.80
$(\frac{1}{80}, 500)$	‡	‡	2800	110.98	359	149.67	278	165.66	231	212.18
$(\frac{1}{100}, 400)$	‡	‡	1640	130.17	398	338.65	329	381.20	279	518.72
$(\frac{1}{100}, 500)$	‡	‡	3280	262.96	402	340.15	333	388.01	281	516.17

`sCMRH`(m) requires the most `MVPs` for reaching convergence criteria than other four shifted Krylov subspace methods, the CPU time elapsed by `sCMRH`(m) is the least. On the other hand, it notes that `sGMRES`(m) and `sCMRH`(m) use the similar number of matrix-vector multiplications, but the latter one again uses the less CPU time elapsed than `sGMRES`(m). From the CPU time elapsed perspective, the performance of `sQMRIDR`(s) is not promising for solving shifted linear systems, because it needs more and more CPU time elapsed with the increasing number of shifts. According to the statement in Ref. [19], for each extra shift, there are therefore $s + 2$ extra n-vectors (maybe complex) of storage required and updated. In other words, the performance of `sQMRIDR`(s) for shifted linear systems is sensitive to the growing number of shifts, whereas both `sGMRES`(m) and `sCMRH`(m) seems to be a little insensitive. So it is the reason that `sQMRIDR`(s) methods are not competitive with other shifted iterative solvers.

Furthermore, to make a comprehensive performance evaluation for our iterative solvers, we list in Table 8 the CPU elapsed time and `MVPs` that are employed for solving six shifted linear systems with different difficulties (in terms of grid size and reaction parameters). Here we mentioned that the large value of convection coefficients $\vec{\beta}$ and reaction parameters for Eq. (5.3) always results in highly nonsymmetric, ill-conditioned finite difference

matrix A [19]. Meanwhile, we also define $Max_{mvps} = 6000$ in this experiment. As seen from Table 8, it remarked that both `sCMRH(`m`)` and `sQMRIDR(`s`)` are able to handle all shifted linear systems while `sGMRES(`m`)` cannot. It may be because the coefficient matrix in the seed system is highly nonsymmetric and indefinite, then `sGMRES(`m`)` is more sensitive than other two shifted iterative solvers to this situation. In addition, although `sQMRIDR(`s`)` always required less number of `MVPs` than those required by other two shifted iterative solvers, it is still more expensive in terms of CPU time elapsed. In above paragraph, we already have explained this similar phenomenon happened to `sQMRIDR(`s`)`. In conclusion, it remarked that the proposed `sCMRH(`m`)` method is still efficient for handling shifted linear systems in terms of CPU time elapsed.

5.5 Experiment with preconditioning for shifted systems

In order to invesitgate the performance of our proposed nested iterative solution techniques for shifted linear systems, we report some preliminary experiments to compare our proposed `Hessen-FCMRH`, `Hessen-FGMRES` and `FOM-FCMRH` with the early established `FOM-FGMRES` [20] method for handling the difficult shifted linear systems. We should note that the norm of *true residual vector* is exploited for checking convergence criteria at each iteration step in outer solvers (i.e., `FCMRH` and `FGMRES`). So the CPU time elapsed may be very different from the results presented in previous subsections if we still use the same test problems as those in previous experiments. In our implementation, the linear system $A\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$ was used as the *seed* system. In `Group I`, we consider some shifted linear systems arising from computing matrix exponential multiplyed with a vector $\exp(\tau L)\boldsymbol{u}_0$ by means of the Carathéodory-Fejér approximation [55] with $\nu = 14$ (number of poles), then the experiments setting is the same as that in [56, Example 2] except different τ. The discretized matrices correspond to the 2D advection-diffusion-reaction equation defined in the square domain $[0, 2] \times [0, 2]$. The size of test matrices L are set as $7,921 \times 7,921$, $9,801 \times 9,801$, $14,161 \times 14,161$, and $19,321 \times 19,321$ corresponding to the grid size $h = 1/90, 1/100, 1/120, 1/140$. The the matrix is generated by MATLAB codes downloaded from https://numerical-analysis.uibk.ac.at/exp-int-software. The numerical results of different nested solvers are reported in Table 9.

Table 9: Results of different solvers for test problems (`Group I`) in terms of the number of inner and outer iterations and `CPU`.

		Hessen-FCMRH		Hessen-FGMRES		FOM-FCMRH		FOM-FGMRES	
(h, τ)	IT_in	IT_out	CPU	IT_out	CPU	IT_out	CPU	IT_out	CPU
$(\frac{1}{90}, 0.05)$	120	2	0.392	3	0.987	3	0.571	3	0.992
$(\frac{1}{100}, 0.04)$	100	2	0.381	4	0.737	6	1.815	10	3.059
$(\frac{1}{120}, 0.04)$	160	4	2.376	4	2.380	3	2.915	7	6.886
$(\frac{1}{120}, 0.03)$	150	6	4.649	5	4.104	5	6.422	4	4.672

In `Group II`, we continue the test problems like those in Section 5.4. Except, we choose $\gamma = 0.9$ and $\vec{\beta} = (0/\sqrt{5}, 250/\sqrt{5}, 500/\sqrt{5})^T$ with $h = 0.025$ and $h = 0.02$ for test problems Ξ_1 and Ξ_2. The size of these two test problems is $59,319 \times 59,319$ and $117,649 \times 117,649$, respectively. On the other hand, we set $\gamma = 0.8$ and $\vec{\beta} = (500/\sqrt{5}, 250/\sqrt{5}, 500/\sqrt{5})^T$ with $h = 0.02$ and $h = 0.0125$ for test problems Ξ_3 and Ξ_4. Moreover, the size of these two test problems is $117,649 \times 117,649$ and $493,039 \times 493,039$, respectively. We also note that the rest of experiment settings are the same as those in Experiment 4. The numerical performances of different nested Krylov subspace solvers are listed in Table 10.

Table 10: Results of different solvers for test problems (`Group II`) in terms of the number of inner and outer iterations and `CPU`.

		`Hessen-FCMRH`		`Hessen-FGMRES`		`FOM-FCMRH`		`FOM-FGMRES`	
`Index`	`IT_in`	`IT_out`	`CPU`	`IT_out`	`CPU`	`IT_out`	`CPU`	`IT_out`	`CPU`
Ξ_1	80	2	1.438	3	2.159	3	3.678	3	3.728
Ξ_2	85	3	4.171	4	5.695	5	12.247	5	12.524
Ξ_3	80	7	9.218	9	11.674	12	26.279	7	22.373
Ξ_4	120	4	36.835	9	86.395	‡	‡	4	93.871

In Table 9, we report the CPU elapsed time and the number of inner iterations and outer iterations (for nested Krylov subspace methods), denoted as `IT_in` and `IT_out` respectively, that are employed for solving all seven shifted linear systems up to convergence criteria. These notations is used throughout this subsection. As seen from Table 9, except the last problem, it notes that our proposed combined iterative techniques (`Hessen-FCMRH`) is indeed the most efficient one among these four inner-outer iterative solutions in terms of CPU time elapsed when the number of inner solvers is the same for all inner-outer iterative solvers. As previously mentioned and conclusion in our recent work [33], we already know that the `sHessen` and `sCMRH` method will be cheaper than the `sFOM` and `sGMRES` method, respectively, when they are the similar number of matrix-vector products for convergence. So it is not difficult to note that `Hessen-FCMRH` (even `Hessen-FGMRES`) converges faster than `FOM-FGMRES` and `FOM-FCMRH` in aspects of CPU time elapsed. Additionally, except the case with $(\frac{1}{120}, 0.03)$, it is remarkable to find that `FOM-FCMRH` is still better than `FOM-FGMRES` in terms of CPU time elapsed when the number of their outer iterations are close. Similarly, `Hessen-FCMRH` is also better than `Hessen-FGMRES` in terms of CPU time elapsed. In short, it finds that the proposed nested iterative methods based on Hessenberg process are well attractive for handling shifted linear systems in terms of CPU time elapsed.

Analogously, in Table 10, we report the CPU elapsed time and `IT_in` and `IT_out` that are employed for solving all seven shifted linear systems up to convergence criteria. Based on computational cost of Krylov subspace methods based on Hessenberg and Arnoldi procedures, our proposed `Hessen-FCMRH` method is indeed the most robust one among these four nested iterative solutions in terms of CPU time elapsed when the num-

ber of inner solvers is the same for all inner-outer iterative solvers. Again, it remarks that `Hessen-FCMRH` (even `Hessen-FGMRES`) converges faster than `FOM-FGMRES` and `FOM-FCMRH` in aspects of CPU time elapsed. Additionally, it is highlighted that `FOM-FCMRH` is still better than `FOM-FGMRES` in terms of CPU time elapsed when the number of their outer iterations are close. Similarly, `Hessen-FCMRH` is also better than `Hessen-FGMRES` in terms of CPU time elapsed. That is because that the iterative solvers based on conventional Arnoldi process are often expensive than the iterative methods based on Hessenberg procedure in aspects of CPU time elapsed. Finally, it is remarkable to note that the proposed `Hessen-FCMRH` method is considerably powerful for handling shifted linear systems in terms of CPU time elapsed.

Table 11: Results of different solvers for the last test problem in terms of the number of inner and outer iterations and `CPU`.

	`IT_in = 120`		`IT_in = 110`		`IT_in = 100`		`IT_in = 90`	
`Solver`	`IT_out`	`CPU`	`IT_out`	`CPU`	`IT_out`	`CPU`	`IT_out`	`CPU`
`Hessen-FCMRH`	2	4.214	2	3.755	2	3.359	6	9.197
`Hessen-FGMRES`	2	4.237	3	5.782	3	5.118	6	9.271
`FOM-FCMRH`	2	7.893	3	10.326	5	15.261	18	50.628
`FOM-FGMRES`	2	7.928	3	10.581	5	15.346	8	21.913

Finally, we consider the last test problem arising from Eq. (5.3) with $\gamma = 0.9$, $r = 500$, $\vec{\beta} = (500/\sqrt{5}, 250/\sqrt{5}, 500/\sqrt{5})^T$ and $h = 0.02$. Then the results of our nested iterative schemes under different number of inner iteration counts (i.e, `IT_in`) are listed in Table 11. As seen from Table 11, it notes that our proposal (i.e, `Hessen-FCMRH` with `IT_out = 2` and `IT_in = 100`) has the best performance among these four nested iterative solvers for the last test problem in aspects of CPU time elapsed. It is also highlighted that the nested iterative schemes based on the Arnoldi process always requires more CPU time elapsed than other nested methods based on the Hessenberg procedure, except the case of `IT_in = 90`. Moreover, we find that the larger number of inner iteration counts for nested methods often translates the smaller number of outer iteration steps, whereas the CPU time cost does not always follow this principle. In summary, the proposed `Hessen-FCMRH` method still can be regarded as a robust choice for our last test problem.

6 Conclusions

The work presents two contributions about shifted Krylov subspace methods based on Hessenberg process for efficiently solving shifted linear systems. Firstly, we explore the algorithmic relation between the GMRES(m) and CMRH(m) methods, and it already knows that the CMRH(m) method somtimes can outperform the GMRES(m) method in terms of less CPU time elapsed and slightly less memory. So it motivates us to extend

the CMRH(m) method for solving shifted linear systems by using the similar derivation of restarted shifted GMRES method. Then some numerical results are carried out to illustrate the effectiveness of the shifted CMRH(m) method compared to both `sGMRES(`m`)` and `sQMRIDR(`s`)`($s = 1, 2, 4$) in terms of CPU time elapsed. Then we consider the numerical advantages of shifted Hessenberg method and shifted CMRH method, then the new nested iterative framework of shifted linear systems is proposed based on the Hessenberg procedure. More precisely, we proposed three nested iterative solvers: `Hessen-FCMRH`, `Hessen-FGMRES` and `FOM-FCMRH` for shifted linear systems. the fist two ones often significantly reduce the CPU time elapsed with compared to the `FOM-FGMRES` introduced in [20]. Especially, numerical experiments involving the time integration scheme for 3D fractional/partial differential equations are reported to illustrate the advantages of the proposed nested iterative solvers. These approaches can be very beneficial for an important application in the numerical scheme with evaluating matrix function (see e.g. [3, 4]) for three-dimensional time dependent (fractional) convection-diffusion-reaction equations. This point can be regarded as the second contribution of our manuscript.

In addition, we note that the number of iterations of inner solver are often large, it means that we need more computational memory and time in the whole algorithmic procedure. As an outlook for the future, the shifted Krylov subspace solvers with short-term recurrence, such as shifted BiCGSTAB(ℓ), shifted BiCRSTAB, shifted IDR(s), shifted GPBiCG, shifted TFQMR and shifted QMRIDR(s), can be used as the inner solvers in the nested iterative framework for shifted linear systems, see e.g. [20]. Meanwhile, the restarted techniques often can remedy the issue about linearly increasing memory during the iteration procedure of long-term recurrence Krylov subspace methods, e.g., FOM, GMRES, and CMRH. So we also will focus on developing the restarted shifted versions of FOM, GMRES, Hessenberg, and CMRH as the inner solver. This remains also an interesting topic of future research.

Acknowledgement

The authors are very grateful to Dr. Mohammed Heyouni, Prof. Gang Wu, and Mr. Zhaoli Shen for their constructive discussions and insightful comments. Especially, we would like to thank Dr. Mohammed Heyouni and Dr. Jens-Peter M. Zemke for making their MATLAB package of Ref. [35] and codes of the multi-shifted QMRIDR(s) method, respectively, available for us. This research is supported by 973 Program (2013CB329404), NSFC (61370147, 11301057, and 61402082) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (ZYGX2013J106, ZYGX2014J084, and ZYGX2013Z005).

References

[1] V. Druskin, L. Knizhnerman, M. Zaslavsky, Solution of large scale evolutionary problems using rational krylov subspaces with optimized shifts, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 31 (2009), pp. 3760-3780.

[2] L.N. Trefethen, J.A.C. Weideman, The exponentially convergent trapezoidal rule, *SIAM Rev.*, 56 (2014), pp. 385-458.

[3] J.A.C. Weideman, L.N. Trefethen, Parabolic and hyperbolic contours for computing the Bromwich integral, *Math. Comp.*, 76 (2007), pp. 1341-1356.

[4] R. Garrappa, M. Popolizio, On the use of matrix functions for fractional partial differential equations, *Math. Comput. Simulat.*, 81 (2011), pp. 1045-1056.

[5] B.N. Datta, Y. Saad, Arnoldi methods for large Sylvester-like observer matrix equations, and an associated algorithm for partial spectrum assignment, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 154-156 (1991), pp. 225-244.

[6] M.I. Ahmad, D.B. Szyld, M.B. van Gijzen, Preconditioned multishift BiCG for $\mathcal{H}_2$-optimal model reduction, *Tech. Report 12-06-15*, Department of Mathematics, Temple University (2012), Revised June 2015, 23 pages. Available online at https://www.math.temple.edu/~szyld/reports/IRKA.BICG.report.rev2.pdf.

[7] T. Sakurai, H. Sugiura, A projection method for generalized eigenvalue problems using numerical integration, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 159 (2003), pp. 119-128.

[8] J.C.R. Bloch, T. Breu, A. Frommer, S. Heybrock, K. Schäfer, T. Wettig, Short-recurrence Krylov subspace methods for the overlap Dirac operator at nonzero chemical potential, *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 181 (2010), pp. 1378-1387.

[9] A.K. Saibaba, T. Bakhos, P.K. Kitanidis, A flexible Krylov solver for shifted systems with application to oscillatory hydraulic tomography, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 35 (2013), pp. A3001-A3023.

[10] G. Wu, Y.-C. Wang, X.-Q. Jin, A preconditioned and shifted GMRES algorithm for the PageRank problem with multiple damping factors, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 34 (2012), pp. A2558-A2575.

[11] B. Jegerlehner, Krylov space solvers for shifted linear systems, *arXiv preprint*, hep-lat/9612014, December 15, 1996, 16 pages. Avaiable online at http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-lat/9612014.

[12] A. Frommer, BiCGStab(ℓ) for families of shifted linear systems, *Computing*, 70 (2003), pp. 87-109.

[13] R.W. Freund, Solution of shifted linear systems by quasi-minimal residual iterations, L. Reichel, A. Ruttan, R.S. Varga (Eds.), *Numerical Linear Algebra* (Kent, OH, 1992), de Gruyter, Berlin (1993), pp. 101-121.

[14] V. Simoncini, Restarted full orthogonalization method for shifted linear systems, *BIT*, 43 (2003), pp. 459-466.

[15] Y.-F. Jing, T.-Z. Huang, Restarted weighted full orthogonalization method for shifted linear systems, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 57 (2009), pp. 1583-1591.

[16] J.-F. Yin, G.-J. Yin, Restarted full orthogonalization method with deflation for shifted linear systems, *Numer. Math. Theor. Meth. Appl.*, 7 (2014), pp. 399-412.

[17] Z. Li, G. Gu, Restarted FOM augmented with Ritz vectors for shifted linear systems, *Numer. Math. (J. Chinese Univ.)*, 15 (2006), pp. 40-49.

[18] L. Du, T. Sogabe, S.-L. Zhang, IDR(s) for solving shifted nonsymmetric linear systems, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 274 (2015), pp. 35-43.

[19] M.B. van Gijzen, G.L.G. Sleijpen, J.-P. M. Zemke, Flexible and multi-shift induced dimension reduction algorithms for solving large sparse linear systems, *Numer. Linear Algebra Appl.*, 22 (2015), pp. 1-25.

[20] M. Baumann, M.B. van Gijzen, Nested Krylov methods for shifted linear systems, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 37 (2015), pp. S90-S112.

[21] Y. Saad, Iterative Methods for Sparse Linear Systems (second ed.), SIAM, Philadelphia, USA, 2003.

[22] T. Sogabe, Extensions of the conjugate residual method (Ph.D. dissertation), Department of Applied Physics, University of Tokyo, Japan, 2006. Available online at http://www.ist.aichi-pu.ac.jp/person/sogabe/thesis.pdf.

[23] X.-M. Gu, T.-Z. Huang, J. Meng, T. Sogabe, H.-B. Li, L. Li, BiCR-type methods for families of shifted linear systems, *Comput. Math. Appl.*, 68 (2014), pp. 746-758.

[24] M. Dehghan, R. Mohammadi-Arani, Generalized product-type methods based on bi-conjugate gradient (GPBiCG) for solving shifted linear systems, *Comput. Appl. Math.*, to appear, 2016, 16 pages. DOI: 10.1007/s40314-016-0315-y.

[25] K. Ahuja, E. de Sturler, S. Gugercin, E.R. Chang, Recycling BiCG with an application to model reduction, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 34 (2012), pp. A1925-A1949.

[26] K. Ahuja, P. Benner, E. de Sturler, L. Feng, Recycling BiCGSTAB with an application to parametric model order reduction, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 37 (2015), pp. S429-S446.

[27] H. Sadok, CMRH: A new method for solving nonsymmetric linear systems based on the Hessenberg reduction algorithm, *Numer. Algorithms*, 20 (1999), pp. 303-321.

[28] M. Heyouni, H. Sadok, A new implementation of the CMRH method for solving dense linear systems, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 213 (2008), pp. 387-399.

[29] J.H. Wilkinson, The Algebraic Eigenvalue Problem, Clarendon Press, Oxford, UK, 1965.

[30] D. Stephens, ELMRES: An oblique projection solver for sparse systems of linear equations (Ph.D. dissertation), Florida Institute of Technology, USA, August, 1999. Available online at http://www.ncsu.edu/hpc/Documents/Publications/gary_howell/stephens.ps.

[31] G. Howell, D. Stephens, ELMRES, an oblique projection method for solving systems of sparse linear equations, *Technical Report*, Florida Institute of Technology, March 24, 2000, 18 pages. Available online at http://ncsu.edu/hpc/Documents/Publications/gary_howell/elmres320.ps.

[32] M. Heyouni, Méthode de Hessenberg Généralisée et Applications, Ph.D. Thesis, Université des Sciences et Technologies de Lille, Décembre, France, 1996. (in Franch)

[33] X.-M. Gu, T.-Z. Huang, G. Yin, B. Carpentieri, C. Wen, Restarted Hessenberg method for shifted nonsymmetric linear systems with applications to fractional differential equations, *arXiv preprint*, 29 Jul. 2015, 24 pages. Available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.08141v1.

[34] K. Zhang, C. Gu, A flexible CMRH algorithm for nonsymmetric linear systems, *J. Appl. Math. Comput.*, 45 (2014), pp. 43-61.

[35] S. Duminil, M. Heyouni, P. Marion, H. Sadok, Algorithms for the CMRH method for dense linear systems, *Numer. Algorithms*, 71 (2016), pp. 383-394.

[36] S. Duminil, A parallel implementation of the CMRH method for dense linear systems, *Numer. Algorithms*, 63 (2013), pp. 127-142.

[37] Y. Saad, M.H. Schultz, GMRES: A generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving nonsymmetric linear systems, *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, 7 (1986), pp. 856-869.

[38] A. Frommer, U. Glässner, Restarted GMRES for shifted linear systems, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 19 (1998), pp. 15-26.

[39] G. Gu, Restarted GMRES augmented with harmonic Ritz vectors for shifted linear systems, *Int. J. Comput. Math.*, 82 (2005), pp. 837-849.

[40] D. Darnell, R.B. Morgan, W. Wilcox, Deflated GMRES for systems with multiple shifts and multiple right-hand sides, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 429 (2008), pp. 2415-2434.

[41] K.M. Soodhalter, D.B. Szyld, F. Xue, Krylov subspace recycling for sequences of shifted linear systems, *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 81 (2014), pp. 105-118.

[42] K.M. Soodhalter, Two recursive GMRES-type methods for shifted linear systems with general preconditioning, *arXiv preprint*, Feburary 3, 2016, 25 pages. Avaiable online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.4428.

[43] H. Sadok, D.B. Szyld, A new look at CMRH and its relation to GMRES, *BIT*, 52 (2012), pp. 485-501.

[44] V. Simoncini, D.B. Szyld, The effect of non-optimal bases on the convergence of Krylov subspace methods, *Numer. Math.*, 100 (2005), pp. 711-733.

[45] J. Duintjer Tebbens, G. Meurant, On the convergence of Q-OR and Q-MR Krylov methods for solving nonsymmetric linear systems, *BIT*, 56 (2016), pp. 77-97.

[46] T. Sogabe, T. Hoshi, S.-L. Zhang, T. Fujiwara, A numerical method for calculating the Green's function arising from electronic structure theory, in *Frontiers of Computational Science*, Y. Kaneda, H. Kawamura, M. Sasai (Eds.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, (2007), pp. 189-195.

[47] G. Gu, X. Zhou, L. Lin, A flexible preconditioned Arnoldi method for shifted linear systems, *J. Comput. Math.*, 25 (2007), pp. 522-530.

[48] Y. Saad. A flexible inner-outer preconditioned GMRES algorithm, *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 14 (1993), pp. 461-469.

[49] V. Simoncini, D.B. Szyld, Flexible inner-outer Krylov subspace methods, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 40 (2003), pp. 2219-2239.

[50] T. Davis, Y. Hu, The University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection, *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 38 (1) (2011), Article No. 1, 25 pages. Avaiable online at http://www.cise.ufl.edu/research/sparse/matrices/.

[51] D.F. Gleich, PageRank beyond the Web, *SIAM Rev.*, 57 (2015), pp. 321-363.

[52] P. Boldi, M. Santini, S. Vigna, PageRank as a function of the damping factor, in *Proc. 14th Intenational World Wide Web Conference (WWW 2005)*, ACM, New York, USA, 2005, pp. 557-566. DOI: 10.1145/1060745.1060827.

[53] I. Podlubny, Fractional Differential Equations, Academic Press, San Diego, USA, 1999.

[54] S. Zhai, D. Gui, P. Huang, X. Feng, A novel high-order ADI method for 3D fractional convection-diffusion equations, *Int. Commun. Heat Mass Trans.*, 66 (2015), pp. 212-217.

[55] L.N. Trefethen, J.A.C. Weideman, T. Schmelzer, Talbot quadratures and rational approximations, *BIT*, 46 (2006), pp. 653-670.

[56] M. Caliari, P. Kandolf, A. Ostermann, S. Rainer, Comparison of software for computing the action of the matrix exponential, *BIT*, 54 (2014), pp. 113-128.